

REMARKS

In view of the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejection and further examination are respectfully requested.

The Applicant would like to thank Examiner Daniel Tekle and Supervisory Examiner Thai Tran for conducting an interview on May 1, 2007 at the USPTO in connection with the above-identified application.

As a result of the above-mentioned interview, Examiner Tran issued an Interview Summary stating, "It appears that the reference (Okada) does not disclose 'an analyzer...' and 'second entry point' as recited in claim 1." Moreover, during the interview Examiner Tran agreed that the Okada reference does not appear to disclose an analyzer operable to detect a change in an attribute of a stream of encoded data, as recited in claim 1. Examiner Tran also agreed that the Okada reference does not appear to disclose a second entry point selected from any point in the stream of encoded data from which playback can begin, since Okada merely teaches the rearrangement of cells which have a defined beginning and ending wherein playback can only begin from the beginning of the cell (which is not any point within the stream of encoded data).

In addition, during the interview the limitations of independent method claims 9 and 12 were briefly discussed. Examiner Tran agreed that claims 9 and 12 recite limitations that are similar to the distinguishing limitations of claim 1, as discussed above (i.e., detecting a change in an attribute, and a second entry point selected from any point).

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Okada reference does not disclose or suggest, (1) an analyzer operable to detect a change in an attribute of a stream of encoded data received by a receiver unit and operable to output detection data containing information which indicates the detection of the change in the attribute, or (2) a second entry point, which represents a user-defined access point selected from any point within the stream of encoded digital data, from which the stream of encoded digital data is operable to begin playing, as recited in independent apparatus claim 1.


Moreover, in view of the Examiners' comments discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that the Okada reference does not disclose or suggest the above-mentioned limitations of method claims 9 and 12, which are similar to the distinguishing limitations recited in independent claim 1.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the Okada reference does not anticipate the invention as recited in claims 1-14. Furthermore, Okada does not suggest the above-discussed limitations of claims 1-14. Therefore, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Okada reference so as to obtain the invention of claims 1-14. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-14 are clearly allowable over the Okada reference.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Hiroshi HAMASAKA et al.

By: 
Charles R. Watts
Registration No. 33,142
Attorney for Applicants

CRW/ALD/nrj
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
May 9, 2007